DOCUMENT RESUME

HE 000 248

ED 025 212

By- Palola[illegible]nest G.; And Others

The Reluctant Planner: The Role of Faculty in Institutional Planning.

California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
Pub Date May 68
Note- 23p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
Descriptors- *Educational Administration, *Educational Planning, Educational Problems, *Faculty, Governance, *Higher Education, Institutional Administration, *Leadership Responsibility, Participation, School Expansion

Data collected during a recent study of statewide planning at 81 institutions indicate (1) that institutional planning has been accomplished largely through committee structures which separate planning efforts of faculty from those of administrators, (2) that active faculty involvement is more evident when they receive administrative encouragement, when a new campus is being developed, or when the function of an institution is undergoing a fundamental change, and (3) that faculty reluctance to participate in planning may continue unless current planning moves toward a more qualitative, goal-oriented approach. A hypothetical situation is presented which clarifies faculty roles and suggests what effective institutional planning should be. A comparison is drawn between current and suggested faculty participation, with discussions on observed similarities and dissimilarities. Contemporary institutional planning focuses on quantitative development involving physical, budgetary, and demographic factors of expansion. It is suggested that faculty play a "reactor" role in quantitative planning, but an "initiator" role in qualitative planning for meaningful policy and practice in higher education. (WM)

THE RELUCTANT PLANNER

THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING

Ernest G. Palola

Timothy Lehmann

William R. Blischke

May, 1968

Center for Research and Development

in Higher Education

University of California

Berkeley, California

ED025212

ED025212

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE RELUCTANT PLANNER

The Role of Faculty in Institutional Planning

> "...We patch here and there, but we still procrastinate about meeting the issues squarely. Only now, years later than it should have happened, do we see a general stirring, a growing sense of urgency among educational leaders regarding the need for clearly establishing the philosophy of their institutions and systematically planning their long-range futures. Only now is there an increasing awareness that, given the rapidly changing world we live in, we can no longer expect anything to remain the same, even educational anythings...." Sammuel B. Gould, Chancellor, State University of New York.

Since World War II and the post-Sputnik decade, American society has made a notable commitment to universal higher education. Vastly expanded enrollments, the rapid rate of social and technological change, and the heavy demands upon federal, state, and local resources have created monumental pressures on educators, state and federal officials, and the general public to become more seriously concerned about the future direction of higher education. Already forty-three states have developed some form of statewide coordination and planning to cope with these pressures. Such statewide activities are creating substantial pressures for institutional planning, which, in turn, raises questions about how, to what extent, and for what purposes faculty might participate in local planning.

In this paper, we intend to examine the role of faculty in institutional planning. Our objectives are: first, to develop a paradigm for institutional planning which provides some clarification as to what faculty participation in planning <u>might</u> include from a theoretical perspective; second, to present and discuss data which describe how faculty are presently participating in planning at a sample of institutions; to

draw comparisons between behavior suggested by the paradigm and the actual participation of faculty in planning; and, finally, to present an interpretation of the observed similarities and dissimilarities between suggested and actual patterns of participation.

The articles which discuss the role of faculty in college and university governance, in the main, are based on the opinions, beliefs, and convictions of individuals or the "official positions" of professional associations concerned withthe "rights and responsibilities" of faculty.[1] These "judgments," however, are difficult to assess since no information is given to suggest the underlying assumptions or premises about university or college organization from which these "judgments" are derived. A similar evaluation applies to the few articles written about the role of faculty in institutional planning itself. The content of these articles goes little beyond broad assertions that the faculty "ought to participate" and "ought to be consulted" in planning. Unfortunately, however, no clear definition is given regarding the activities referred to as planning.

One of the best statements related to the role of faculty in planning appears in the winter, 1966 issue of the A A U P Bulletin.[2] In the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," issued jointly by A A U P, A C E, and A G B U C, there are several themes which are relevant for our purposes. First, the authors assert that an effective and workable relationship between institutions, on the one hand, and legislative and executive governmental authorities, on the other, requires that the academic institution have a unified view of itself. Second, a multiplicity of factors and dimensions which permeate the several tasks performed by institutions necessitates the full opportunity for joint planning among governing boards, administration, faculty, students, and others. Third,

certain issues require the initiating capacity and decision-making responsibility of all institutional participants, and differences in the weight each voice has should be set by reference to the responsibility each party has for the issue or matter at hand. Fourth, long-range planning, which is one of the most important parts of institutional responsibility, should be a "central and continuing concern in the academic community." Fifth, the president is the chief planning officer of an institution and has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. And finally, the faculty has primary responsibility for curriculum, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those portions of student life which relate to the educational process.

This article and others which discuss the faculty's role in governance and planning do not provide detail about the content and processes of planning, nor suggest a theoretical rationale for faculty participation. Further, these articles are not based on empirical research about the current patterns of participation by faculty in different types of planning. In order to overcome some of these limitations, we begin by developing a paradigm for institutional planning.

A General Paradigm for Institutional Planning

The primary problem that all institutions face is the definition of their distinctive mission and role. A second, but very closely related problem, is the necessity to continuously and consciously review and adapt their mission to new commitments. Phillip Selznick in Leadership in Administration states that, "A university led by administrators without a clear sense of values to be achieved may fail dismally while steadily growing larger and more secure."[3] Thus, quantitative expansion, such as that

taking place in higher education today, need not lead to an examination of institutional mission and role. Therefore, the basic function of planning, as we view it, is that of defining and adapting institutional mission and role according to basic value commitments.

One of the central aspects of institutional leadership is to define basic value commitments. In contrast to other organizational settings, where leadership is commonly associated with top-level administrators, a broader view is necessary in higher education. It seems more appropriate to view institutional leadership within colleges and universities as shared by faculty, students, administrators, and trustees. It is diffuse, not concentrated. Burton Clark says that authority in colleges and universities "is not as closely knit, nor as hierarchical, as in most other settings."[4] Abbott states that administration is to be defined "...not as people but as the processes by which and through which objectives are defined, resources are developed and organized in pursuit of these objectives, evaluation of results is accomplished, plans are made and remade. On this definition, obviously 'administrators' have no monopoly on 'administration'; the faculty has a vast stake and role in it."[5]

A further distinction by Selznick is appropriate to this discussion of institutional leadership and planning. He draws a dichotomy between two substantially different types of decisions; those that are "critical" to the institution, i.e., define its ends, design its enterprise, translate the design into reality; and those that are "routine," i.e., refer to the solution of day-to-day problems that keep the organization running efficiently.[6] A review of planning in higher education reveals that the "logic of efficiency" predominates. Contemporary planning is preoccupied with "routine" decisions or logistics--physical, fiscal, demographic factors

of expansion and quantitative rather than qualitative development.[7] The paradigm which follows suggests a reorientation to planning where the making of "critical" decisions becomes the predominate concern. This is not to preclude the important questions and decisions concerned with efficiency or day-to-day affairs, but to place these in their "proper" context.

Given the premise that planning is a central feature of institutional leadership shared by all major participants, we can suggest further dimensions of a general paradigm for institutional planning. These dimensions are:

1 - Scope - Long-range planning includes the examination and determination of all the major policies about institutional functions and activities: the definition of mission and role, programs (research and public service) and curricula, methods and form of instruction; recruitment, selection, promotion, and general welfare of the faculty; admissions criteria, academic standards, and student affairs; finances and facilities.

2 - Priority - The definition of mission and role so as to identify special competencies and inadequacies is the first and most basic task of institutional planning. This includes the specification of priorities among the multiple ends of educational institutions as well as the establishment of priorities with regard to the other dimensions listed above.

3 - Continuity - Planning is a continuous process of adapting to changing conditions resulting in written plans but never rigidly attached to any one plan.

4 - Research - Planning is informed and highly dependent on research which takes as its foci the (several) critical questions and key issues facing the institution.

5 - Participants - Faculty, students, administrators, and trustees all share responsibility for institutional planning. Each group has unique perspectives, attitudes, and types of expertise.

6 - Participation - Planning involves both the initiation of and reaction to ideas where the role of initiator or reactor is played by various groups at different times. An exchange and interaction of ideas, experiences, interests, and attitudes is necessary. Participation will likely be heightened when special incentives--released time and additional resources--are provided.

7 - Structure - Planning requires a special structure since existing student, faculty, and administrative structures are geared primarily to routine, day-to-day issues and often focus on

fairly limited parts of the total institution. To encourage open communication among all parties and promote an institutional perspective, some type of joint steering committee is necessary. This group would likely work in close cooperation with the existing committee structure.

8 - Implementation - The planning process includes specification of a time table and the general strategy by which specific proposals will be put into action.

Some additional specification of the paradigm is necessary since our primary concern is the role of faculty in institutional planning. A clearer rationale is needed for faculty participation. This rationale might be based on the following: first, a plan must assess existing strengths and weaknesses in institutional curricula and programs; second, a plan must be sensitive to significant subject-matter developments and new approaches to teaching in the various disciplines; and third, a plan must be informed by judgments about the educational soundness and feasibility of proposed modifications or additions to curricula, programs, and methods of instruction. These important reflections, sensitivities, and judgments should emerge primarily from the faculty since they are most directly and continuously confronted with such questions, issues, and developments. It is questionable whether administrators can provide this type of expertise since they are becoming increasingly preoccupied with external pressures and issues, and thus tending to lose contact with the academic processes in their own institutions.[8]

Beyond the above rationale for faculty participation in institutional planning, we also need some specification about the roles faculty should play with regard to different aspects of this effort. Earlier it was mentioned that a distinction might be drawn between two different roles in planning--initiator and reactor. It is suggested that faculty play an initiator role in institutional planning with regard to critical issues

and questions about curricula and programs, methods of instruction, support for research, the selection and promotion of faculty, standards for academic performance of students and for the granting of degrees. In contrast, there are activities and functions not so readily identified with the responsibilities of any single group and not as directly related to the central interests of faculty, e.g., institutional mission and role, standards of admission for students, aspects of student-campus life related to educationl processes, and fiscal and facilities items. In these areas it is suggested that the faculty play more of a reactor role in institutional planning.

What these proposals suggest about faculty participation in institutional planning is that none of the general activities and functions of colleges and universities are irrelevant to the faculty. Nevertheless, this is not meant to imply that all faculty are to be involved in all aspects of institutional planning. Faculty participation may take many forms and occur at different levels within an institution. Finally, to reiterate a point mentioned in the joint "Statement," the president is the chief planning officer of an institution. The faculty are advisory to him and, in the end, it is he who must assume responsibility for planning.

This paradigm provides, then, a set of general expectations about the style of planning, the process and form of participation by various institutional components, and the particular areas where faculty ought to exercise leadership based on their special skills and competencies. One might suggest that the paradigm needs more specificity and greater clarity. However, to do this would overlook the complexities of planning and the uniqueness of institutional settings. No single paradigm for

institutional planning could work well in all types of institutions. Thus, the paradigm outlined above suggests rather than prescribes, sets general rather than specific expectations, and is intended to stimulate rather than dictate thinking and ideas about planning.

Procedures

The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education has recently conducted a study of statewide planning and its institutional effects in four states--California, Florida, Illinois, and New York. Although the major thrust of this study was to identify how critical decisions made outside institutions affect their mission and role, considerable data were collected through interviews and documents about institutional planning within the sample of eighty-one colleges and universities. These institutions included public and private universities, state colleges, and junior or community colleges. A purposely selected sample of faculty and administrators were interviewed on each campus using a semi-structured interview schedule which included the following items: present and past planning activities, the rationale for planning, the arrangements by which plans were or are being developed, the extent to which plans have been implemented, the basic questions or issues around which planning is organized, and the attitudes held by faculty about planning. Approximately 400 interviews were conducted with faculty and administrators at these institutions and the interviews ranged in length from one to three hours.

Findings and Interpretation

The data analysis is organized under three topics: Type of Planning, Participation, and Reasons for Faculty Involvement. The first two topics are used primarily to establish a context for the discussion of the faculty role in planning. Comparisons among institutions with regard to each topic are made in terms of five control variables: functional type (i.e., university, state colleges, and junior colleges), public versus private, new or changing versus older-traditional, and primary emphasis on qualitative or quantitative planning. Our fifth comparison, by states, is intended to assess the influence of the statewide network on institutional planning.

Types of Planning

Nine dimensions are used to characterize the type of planning in the past at eighty-one institutions studied. The dimensions are: qualitative/quantitative, periodic/continuous, integrated/piecemeal, institutionwide/partial, inductive/deductive, innovative/routine, research based/based on limited data, priorities/no priorities, and motivated by internal/external pressures.[9] At the most general level the data show that all institutions have used some form of planning in the past.[10] This can be generally characterized in terms of the above dichotomies as quantitative, periodic, piecemeal, institutionwide, deductive, routine, based on limited research, and initiated by pressures external to the institutions. There was an even split among institutions on setting or not setting priorities. It was also found that most institutions (51/81) are presently developing a comprehensive plan. In a few cases (9/81) this effort represents a marked shift toward greater emphasis on matters of educational policy.

Institutions classified as having qualitative planning (21/81) also have a type of planning which is significantly more integrated and innovative, more likely to be institutionwide, and which reflects the establishment of priorities among educational programs and objectives. Comparisons across states suggest that planning in the New York institutions is performed on a more continuous basis. In comparison to state colleges and junior colleges, major public universities more often use an inductive approach to planning and more frequently base their planning on special research and related studies.

Contrary to what one might generally expect, we found no significant differences in the type of planning at public versus private institutions, nor at new or changing versus older-traditional institutions. For both of these comparisons an intervening variable--qualitative planning--is so distributed that anticipated differences are masked.

Participation

Three dimensions are used to characterize participation in planning. These include: use of special or existing structures; whether this structure is joint (faculty and administrators) or separate (faculty or administrators); and the amount of faculty participation in the planning effort, classified as medium-heavy or light.[11]

The data show that planning presently underway is accomplished primarily through existing committee structures, which usually separate the planning efforts of faculty from those of administrators. Participation by faculty is light in the majority of institutions. No important changes in this pattern occur when comparisons are made across states or by new or changing versus older-traditional institutions.

Differences do, however, emerge when institutions are classified according to qualitative/quantitative, public/private, and functional type. For example, faculty participation is medium/heavy in those institutions characterized as having qualitative planning. A joint structure for planning is more often used by public institutions, and major universities are more likely to make special provisions for conducting research related to planning beyond the existing institutional research offices.

Reasons for Faculty Involvement

In general, the data show that administrative encouragement is most often cited as the reason for faculty involvement in planning. Other important reasons are the opening of a new campus or a major change in mission and role and the external system--e.g., central office, or coordinating agency--encourages us to plan. It is important to note that these reasons derive from the organization or external system. Faculty are not generally motivated to participate out of a commitment to the importance of planning.

The reasons most often cited for reluctance to participate in planning include: planning is an administrative task, the traditional disciplinary orientation decreases commitment to the institution, faculty-administration and faculty conflicts divert available time and energy, and faculty are impractical, inexperienced, and incapable of taking an institutional perspective. These findings identify, in part, a fundamental issue in institutional planning, i.e., planning is not thought of as a legitimate part of the faculty role.

Contrasts emerge when institutions are classified by the control variables. Cross-state comparisons show that administrative encouragement

for planning is cited significantly more often in California and New York (cf. Table 1). That the external system encourages planning is mentioned significantly most often in New York. These findings can be accounted for, in part, by the legislative mandate for quadrennial planning in New York. Also, several of the institutions in the California sample are preparing 1968 plans. Our study coincided with the preparation of these plans, and thus we obtained higher response rates. A second factor accounting for this response pattern is the degree of decentralization in these states. In California and New York the responsibility for planning rests more with the segments, i.e., SUNY, CUNY, University of California, California State Colleges. In contrast, planning is controlled more centrally in Florida and Illinois through their respective statewide coordinating agencies.

In California, significantly more references are made to the fact that the external system hinders planning and that planning is seen as an ineffective means to ends. These two reasons are cited at almost every university, state college, and junior college in our sample of California institutions. This probably reflects, in part, the conflicts and tensions regarding the rather highly formalized and centralized systems for budgeting and program review. These often have the effect of stifling and undermining efforts toward creative and innovative planning. California also differs significantly from the other three states as regards the frequency with which internal faculty-administration and faculty conflict is mentioned. Some of this conflict may be accounted for by the reasons cited in the second comparison. In addition, this high level of conflict, especially at the state colleges, reflects both efforts to increase substantially the voice of faculty in decision making and the

drive toward unionization.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

No striking results occur when institutions are categorized by functional type. However, the view that the traditional disciplinary orientation hinders planning predominates in universities and is cited least often in junior colleges. Administrators tend to encourage faculty involvement in planning more often at state colleges and junior colleges than at universities.

A comparison of public and private institutions reveals some interesting differences (cf. Table 2). Faculty-administration and faculty conflicts are cited at 68% of the public institutions as the reason why faculty are reluctant to participate in planning. In contrast, this reason was cited at only 23% of the private institutions. Furthermore, faculty are less often viewed as impractical, inexperienced, and incapable of taking an institutionwide perspective in private institutions. The external system is considered a hindrance to planning at 50% of the public institutions but at only one private institution. Similarly, internal conflicts and the view that faculty are impractical, inexperienced, and incapable of taking an institutionwide perspective differentiate institutions doing quantitative planning from those doing qualitative planning (cf. Table 3). These findings suggest the types of institutional settings where planning has a more central role and where faculty are more actively involved. A more positive attitude toward faculty involvement appears to be associated with private institutions and those institutions where a more qualitative type of planning exists.

[Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here]

Again, contrary to expectations, no marked differences appear between new or changing versus older-traditional institutions as regards the reasons for faculty involvement. At a number of older-traditional private institutions, faculty are highly involved in planning. Thus, anticipated differences are cancelled out by this intervening factor.

Summary and Conclusions

The most important findings are: (1) Although the style and form of past planning differs in most respects from the general paradigm, a recent trend toward more comprehensive and sophisticated planning is developing. (2) Faculty are more actively involved in planning when they receive administrative encouragement, when a new campus is being developed, or when the mission and role of an institution is undergoing a fundamental change. Reluctance to become involved in planning is associated with older-traditional campuses which have no special traditions or external pressures to promote and encourage planning, where internal conflicts are frequent, where faculty are perceived as not qualified to contribute to planning, and where a commitment by faculty and administrators to the traditional-discipline orientation predominates. (3) Important differences exist in the type of planning, participation in planning, and reasons for faculty involvement when institutions are classified by state, by qualitative or quantitative planning, and by public and private; less dramatic contrasts occur when comparisons are based on functional type and new or changing versus older-traditional institutions.

The findings and conclusions suggest that faculty reluctance to participate in planning may continue until: (1) The character of planning is changed toward a more qualitative, goal oriented activity.

(2) Organizational and professional recognition and encouragement are given for participation in planning. (3) Planning becomes a more central and effective instrument for change within higher education. The general paradigm presented earlier suggests the ways in which faculty can meaningfully contribute to a reformulation and a more sophisticated form of institutional planning.

Footnotes

1 American Association of University Professors, "The Place and Function of Faculties in Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin (Spring, 1955), pp. 62-81; American Association of University Professors, "Faculty Participation in College and University Government," AAUP Bulletin (Winter, 1962), pp. 321-323; American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, and American Association of Governing Boards, "A Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin (Winter, 1966), pp.3-14; American Association for Higher Education, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (AAHE: Washington, D.C., 1967); Abbott, Frank (editor), Faculty-Administration Relationships (American Council on Education: Washington, D.C., 1958); Abbott, Frank, "Critique: The Role of Faculty in College Administration," in Studies of College Faculty (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education: Boulder, Colorado, 1961), pp. 103-110; Clark, Burton R., "The Role of Faculty in College Administration," in Studies of College Faculty (Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education: Boulder, Colorado, 1961), pp. 83-102; Dodds, Harold W., The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker (McGraw-Hill Book Company: New York, 1962), pp. 167-168; Fenlon, Paul E., "Statewide Coordination and College and University Faculties," AAUP Bulletin (Winter, 1967), pp. 408-411; Hathaway, Dale E., "What Is the Responsibility of the Faculty in Institutional Planning?" in Current Issues in Higher Education (Association for Higher Education: Washington, D.C., 1960), pp. 124-127; Hill, Forest G., "The Faculty Senate and Educational-Policy-Making," Paper presented at the 22nd National Conference on Higher Education, Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 6, 1967; Keenan, Boyd R., "Are Specialized Faculty Members Competent to Help

Formulate Educational Policy?" Journal of Higher Education (November, 1962), pp. 446-451; McNeil, Gordon H., "Faculty Participation in College and University Government: A Utilitarian Approach," AAUP Bulletin (Winter, 1962), pp. 364-367; Stone, Donald C., "Perspectives of a President on the Rights, Responsibilities, and Relationships of a College Faculty," The Educational Record (October, 1956), pp. 285-291; Sullivan, Richard H., "Administrative-Faculty Relationships in Colleges and Universities," Journal of Higher Education (June, 1956), pp. 308-326.

2 Ibid.

3 Selznick, Phillip, Leadership in Administration (Row, Peterson and Company: Evanston, Illinois, 1957), p. 27.

4 Clark, op. cit., p. 99.

5 Abbott, op. cit., 1961, p. 105; the most recent statement supporting this position can be found in AAHE statement, op. cit., pp. 15-26.

6 Selznick, op. cit., pp. 29-38.

7 Livesey, Lionel J., Jr., "Can Higher Education Be Planned?" Unpublished address presented to the National Science Foundation, February 27, 1968, p. I-4.

8 Clark, Burton R., Educating the Expert Society (Chandler Publishing Company: San Francisco, 1962), p. 158.

9 The nine dimensions used to characterize the type of planning are generally defined as follows:

Qualitative/quantitative - Qualitative planning involves the primary consideration of educational effectiveness; whereas the quantitative mode simply projects enrollments to determine budgetary, staff, and facilities needs.

Periodic/continuous - Periodic planning is generally a reaction to crisis situations or outside demands from foundations, accrediting agencies, etc. Continuous planning, on the other hand, recognizes that the process is a never-ending adaptation to new conditions and commitments.

Integrated/piecemeal - Integrated planning, in contrast to a piecemeal approach, recognizes the inter-relatedness of decisions regarding academic, facilities, and budgetary issues.

Institutionwide/partial - An institutionwide plan attempts to coordinate the overall development of all academic units. Partial plans are limited to a particular college, school, division, or department.

Inductive/deductive - The inductive approach begins at the smallest organizational units and consists of a compilation of these plans into an institutional plan. Deductive planning starts with an institutionwide perspective and is then translated into specific plans for each organizational subunit.

Innovative/routine - Innovative plans map out new directions and approaches for the institution, while routine plans simply extrapolate the status quo.

Research based/limited data - This dimension attempts to assess the degree to which planning decisions are based on data regarding the relevant aspects of the institution and its environment.

Priorities/no priorities - Some plans simply consist of a list of the multiple goals of the institution while others specify the priorities among them.

Motivated by internal/external pressures - The stimulus for planning

may come from either internal organizational forces or pressures from external organizations.

10 It is important to realize that the four states selected for this study have relatively more experience with and emphasis on planning than most other states.

11 The level of faculty participation in planning was based on a comparative qualitative judgment of such factors as the number of faculty involved, the types of committees utilized, the amount of faculty time invested, and whether the faculty played an initiating or reacting role in the process. By classifying an instituion as <u>light</u>, we mean that there is no special planning structure which brings together all participants and that only a limited number of faculty are involved in a reactive planning capacity.

TABLE 1. REASONS FOR FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING, BY STATE

STATE	POSITIVE				NEGATIVE								
	1*	2	3*	4	5	6*	7*	8	9*	10	11*	12	13
California N=25**	76% (19)	32% (8)	16% (4)	28% (7)	28% (7)	60% (15)	80% (20)	36% (9)	72% (18)	76% (19)	88% (22)	52% (13)	48% (12)
Florida N=11	27% (3)	36% (4)	9% (1)	- (0)	27% (3)	18% (2)	73% (8)	27% (3)	9% (1)	27% (3)	27% (3)	- (0)	- (0)
Illinois N=19	21% (4)	37% (7)	10% (2)	5% (1)	10% (2)	16% (3)	42% (8)	- (0)	5% (1)	26% (5)	42% (8)	37% (7)	10% (2)
New York N=26	88% (23)	19% (5)	58% (15)	23% (6)	15% (4)	19% (5)	50% (13)	12% (3)	15% (4)	42% (11)	42% (11)	42% (11)	31% (8)
Total N=81	60% (49)	30% (24)	27% (22)	17% (14)	20% (16)	31% (25)	60% (49)	18% (15)	30% (24)	47% (38)	54% (44)	38% (31)	27% (22)

1. Administration Encourages Participation
2. New Campus, Change in Mission and Role
3. External System Encourages Participation
4. Positive Connotation
5. Lack of Tradition for Planning
6. External System Hinders Planning
7. Planning is an Administrative Task
8. Quantitative Nature of Planning
9. Plan Ineffective Means to Ends
10. Discipline-Tradition Orientation
11. Faculty-Administration, Faculty Conflicts
12. Faculty Impractical, Inexperienced, and No Institutionwide Perspective
13. Negative Connotations, Faculty Apathy

* Significant by Chi-Square test at the .05 level or less.

** N's and frequencies refer to the number of institutions. Percentages are based on the number of institutions in each row.

TABLE 2. REASONS FOR FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING, BY PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

	POSITIVE				NEGATIVE								
	1	2*	3*	4	5	6*	7	8	9	10	11*	12	13*
Public	59%	35%	38%	24%	24%	50%	62%	24%	41%	56%	68%	44%	44%
N=34**	(20)	(12)	(13)	(8)	(8)	(17)	(21)	(8)	(14)	(19)	(23)	(15)	(15)
Private	59%	4%	4%	23%	27%	-	54%	14%	27%	50%	23%	23%	14%
N=22	(13)	(1)	(1)	(5)	(6)	(0)	(12)	(3)	(6)	(11)	(5)	(5)	(3)
% Difference	0%	31%	34%	1%	3%	50%	8%	10%	14%	6%	45%	21%	30%
	(33)	(13)	(14)	(13)	(14)	(17)	(33)	(11)	(20)	(30)	(28)	(20)	(18)

1. Administration Encourages Participation
2. New Campus, Change in Mission and Role
3. External System Encourages Participation
4. Positive Connotation
5. Lack of Tradition for Planning
6. External System Hinders Planning
7. Planning is an Administrative Task
8. Quantitative Nature of Planning
9. Plan Ineffective Means to Ends
10. Discipline-Tradition Orientation
11. Faculty-Administration, Faculty Conflicts
12. Faculty Impractical, Inexperienced, and No Institutionwide Perspective
13. Negative Connotations, Faculty Apathy

* Significant by Chi-Square test at the .05 level or less.

** N's and frequencies refer to the number of institutions. Percentages based on the total number of institutions in each row.

TABLE 3. REASONS FOR FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING, BY QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE PLANNING

	POSITIVE				NEGATIVE								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11*	12*	13
Quantitative N=60**	63% (38)	27% (16)	28% (17)	18% (11)	22% (13)	33% (20)	65% (39)	23% (14)	32% (19)	52% (31)	62% (37)	47% (28)	32% (19)
Qualitative N=21	52% (11)	38% (8)	24% (5)	14% (3)	14% (3)	24% (5)	48% (10)	5% (1)	24% (5)	33% (7)	33% (7)	14% (3)	14% (3)
% Difference	11% (49)	11% (24)	4% (22)	4% (14)	8% (16)	9% (25)	17% (49)	18% (15)	8% (24)	19% (38)	29% (44)	33% (31)	18% (22)

1. Administration Encourages Participation
2. New Campus, Change in Mission and Role
3. External System Encourages Participation
4. Positive Connotation
5. Lack of Tradition for Planning
6. External System Hinders Planning
7. Planning is an Administrative Task
8. Quantitative Nature of Planning
9. Plan Ineffective Means to Ends
10. Discipline-Tradition Orientation
11. Faculty-Administration, Faculty Conflicts
12. Faculty Impractical, Inexperienced, and No Institutionwide Perspective
13. Negative Connotations, Faculty Apathy

* Significant by Chi-Square test at the .05 level or less.

** N's and frequencies refer to the number of institutions. Percentages based on the total number of institutions in each row.